

REMARKS

The examiner will note that claim 1 has been amended by incorporation of the limitation of claim 17 and thereby represents claim 17 rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection for obviousness as set forth in paragraph 5 of the office action is the only rejection of record which may remain viable. To the extent that it might be viable it is respectfully traversed. The teaching at column 1, lines 53-57 of Antoni is acknowledged. However, that disclosure is by no means suggestive of a “motor”. While a “force generator” is referred to at column 4, lines 31-37, Antoni describes that “force generator” as “arranged at the other end of the tool machine spindle.” It is less than clear that this “force generator” “arranged at the other end of the tool machine spindle” is the same as the “force-activated moveable drive member” of the teaching cited by the examiner. As stated at column 4, lines 31-37 the “force generator” is not shown in the drawings. What is clear is that the “force”, whether transmitted through a “pressure medium” or otherwise, is centrifugal force generated by the power of the machine in turning the spindle. See, for example, column 4, lines 43-45. The mechanism by which the centrifugal force is transmitted to the clamping jaws 2 would not be considered a “motor.”

Further, applicants here are claiming a chucking/inserting apparatus whereas Antoni discloses simply a work chucking apparatus and, as a consequence, the motor of the present invention functions to control the chucking force of the chuck fingers which in turn facilitates insertion as taught, for example, at page 28, line 17 to page 29, line 3 of the Substitute Specification.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 7 further distinguishes the claimed invention from anything suggested by the combination of Hall et al and Buck. The examiner argues that “applicants should note that gravity pull is equivalent to applicants’ means for pushing.” Firstly, it is respectfully submitted that the examiner’s statement is incorrect. The present invention enables the work, e.g. a piston, to be inserted either vertically or horizontally into the insertion hole, e.g., a cylinder bore. This capability for horizontal insertion, in and of itself, negates any theory of equivalency with gravity. Further, the tight tolerances of today’s modern piston engines would make it difficult to insert a piston into a cylinder bore vertically, with the only force being the pull of gravity, especially in a modern production line with a short tact time. Secondly, the examiner’s theory of equivalency, even if correct, would not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. If there was some suggestion in a reference of record of such an equivalency, in this hypothetical, there might be a *prima facie* case for obviousness. However, such a teaching or suggestion is nowhere to be found in the art of record.

Regarding claim 8, and the rejection for obviousness thereof as set forth in paragraph 4 of the office action, Yokomachi discloses chamfered edges provided in order to decrease pressure losses which occur when a gas in the compression chamber exits the discharge port. Such a structure is totally unrelated to the apparatus of either Hall et al or Buck and, for this reason, the hypothetical combination of reference teachings adopted by the examiner is considered to be improper.

In conclusion, it is respectfully requested that the examiner reconsider the rejections of record in view of the present amendments and foregoing comments with a view toward allowance of all of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,


George A. Loud
Reg. No. 25,814

Dated: June 30, 2004

LORUSSO, LOUD & KELLY
3137 Mount Vernon Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22305
(703) 739-9393